

Maria E. Quiroga  
Nevada State Bar Number: 13939  
7935 W. Sahara Ave  
Suite #103  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117  
Tel (702) 972-8348  
[Maria@QuirogaLawOffice.com](mailto:Maria@QuirogaLawOffice.com)

*Attorney for the Plaintiffs*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

<b>JUAN FRANCISCO EGUIZABAL</b>	)	<b>Case No.: 2:24-cv-02415-JCM-MDC</b>
<b>VALIENTE, SANDRA PATRICIA</b>	)	
<b>LOPEZ DE EGUIZABAL, OSCAR</b>	)	
<b>GEOVANNY EGUIZABAL LOPEZ,</b>	)	
<b>JOSUE ARTURO EGUIZABAL</b>	)	<b>MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO</b>
<b>LOPEZ, and, EMANUEL ISAAC</b>	)	<b>FILE RESPONSE TO</b>
<b>EGUIZABAL LOPEZ,</b>	)	<b>DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO</b>
	)	<b>DISMISS</b>
<b>Plaintiffs,</b>	)	
	)	<b>(First Request)</b>
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>LOREN K. MILLER,</b>	)	
<b>ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS,</b>	)	
<b>UR MENDOZA JADDOU,</b>	)	
	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

Pursuant to Rule 6(b)(1)(B) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule IA 6-1(a) of this Court's Local Rules, Plaintiffs Juan Francisco Eguizabal Valiente, Sandra Patricia Lopez De Eguizabal, Oscar Geovanny Eguizabal Lopez, Josue Arturo Eguizabal Lopez, and Emanuel Isaac Eguizabal Lopez, through undersigned counsel, hereby move this Honorable Court for an Order extending the time to file their response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss their Complaint and state as follows:

1. Plaintiffs filed their Complaint on December 30, 2024.

2. Plaintiffs served Defendants with a copy of the Summons and Complaint via certified mail on January 10, 2025.
3. On March 11, 2025, Defendants filed their first stipulation to enlarge time to answer the complaint by 45 days, or until April 25, 2025, which this Court granted on March 12, 2025.
4. On April 24, 2025, Defendants filed a second stipulation to extend time to answer the Complaint, requesting a 21-day extension from April 25, 2025, to May 16, 2025. That stipulation was granted by this Court on April 25, 2025.
5. On May 13, 2025, Defendants filed a third stipulation to extend time to answer the Complaint by another 7 days, from May 16, 2025, to May 23, 2025. That stipulation was also granted by the Court on May 14, 2025.
6. On May 23, 2025, Defendants filed their Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Complaint.
7. Following its review of the Motion to Dismiss, Plaintiffs determined the appropriate response would be to amend the complaint pursuant to F.R.C.P. 15(a), to address/cure the putative issues raised in the Motion.
8. Plaintiffs calendared the deadline for filing the amended complaint as June 13, 2025, pursuant to F.R.C.P. 15(a)(1)(B), which prescribes a 21-day time frame for filing an amended complaint in response to a 12(b) motion.
9. Unfortunately, due to an administrative error, the Plaintiffs overlooked the notation on the Docket Sheet in this matter that set the deadline for responding to the Motion to Dismiss as June 6, 2025.
10. Plaintiffs have only today learned of their oversight. They had already determined the need to file a motion for an extension of time to respond to the Motion to Dismiss as of

1 last week, when they believed the deadline was June 13, 2025, because the press of  
2 other business, including two intervening briefs to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals,  
3 necessitated additional time until June 20, 2025. They had reached out to opposing  
4 counsel on May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025, to determine whether Defendants would stipulate to such  
5 extension. They did not hear back from opposing counsel until today. Opposing  
6 counsel alerted them to their error.

7 11. Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 6(b)(1)(A) and Local Rule IA 6-1(a), this Court may grant a  
8 motion for extension of deadline filed after the original deadline has expired if the  
9 movant demonstrates “excusable neglect.”

10 12. Plaintiffs calendared their deadline as June 13, 2025, based on the explicit 21-day time  
11 period set forth in F.R.C.P. 15(a)(1)(B). The docket sheet, however, set the deadline  
12 as June 6, 2025. Owing to an administrative error, Plaintiffs did not catch this  
13 discrepancy until today. This was a good faith mistake, amounting to excusable  
14 neglect.

15 13. This is Plaintiff’s first request for an extension of time.

16 14. Although Plaintiffs have consented to each of three extensions of time for Defendants  
17 to answer their Complaint, totaling an additional 73 days, Defendants have declined to  
18 consent to this – Plaintiff’s first – extension Motion.

19 15. Plaintiffs seek an extension of fourteen days from June 6, 2025, or until June 20, 2025,  
20 to file their response to the Motion to Dismiss, which shall be an Amended Complaint  
21 as of course, pursuant to F.R.C.P. 15(a)(1)(B).

22 This request is filed in good faith and not for the purpose of delay.  
23  
24

1 Respectfully submitted this 11<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2025.

2  
3 QUIROGA LAW OFFICE, PLLC

4 /s/ Maria E. Quiroga

5 Maria E. Quiroga

6 Nevada State Attorney ID #13939

7 7935 W Sahara Ave

8 Suite #103

9 Las Vegas, NV 89117

10 Tel: (702) 972-8348

11 [Maria@QuirogaLawOffice.com](mailto:Maria@QuirogaLawOffice.com)

12 *Attorney for the Plaintiffs*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion to Extend Time to File Response to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and Order were served via electronic mail on this 11<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2025, on the following:

Virginia Tomova  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
501 Las Vegas Blvd. So., Ste. 1100  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
[Virginia.Tomova@usdoj.gov](mailto:Virginia.Tomova@usdoj.gov)

/s/ Maria E. Quiroga  
Maria E. Quiroga

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

**JUAN FRANCISCO EGUIZABAL  
VALIENTE, et al.,**

**Plaintiffs,**

**V.**

**LOREN K. MILLER, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**2:24-cv-02415-JCM-MDC**

## ORDER

Plaintiffs' Motion for Extension having been read and considered, good cause having been shown therefor, it is, this 13th day of June, 2025, hereby,

ORDERED, that Plaintiffs' motion is GRANTED, and it is further, hereby,

ORDERED, that Plaintiffs' shall have until June 20, 2025, to file their response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

SO ORDERED June 13, 2025.

James C. Mahan  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE